

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Massie (U.S. Patent No. 4,344,707) in view of Feinleb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,399,356). The Examiner also indicated that Claims 22-24 were allowed and Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depended.

In view of the indicated allowance of the referenced claims, the applicants have rewritten Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 18, 20 and 21 in independent form, each including the limitations of the independent claim and the intervening claims from which they originally depended. Claim 5, 9, 13, 15 and 19 have been amended to depend from allowable claims and Claims 1-3, 7, 12 and 17 have been cancelled, without prejudice. New Claims 25 and 26, depending from allowable Claims 4 and 8, respectively, have been added to recite the same additional limitation of original Claims 10 and 11 with respect to step (d).

With reference to amended independent Claims 4 and 11, the limitations of all claims from which they originally depended were rearranged to more clearly recite the sequence of steps involved. In so doing, it became apparent that step (c) of Claim 1 was redundant because it was mistakenly also recited in the

last step of Claim 2. Therefore, that step was recited only once in the amended claims. The original recitation "using said correction factor ... to calculate a correction coefficient ..." in the last paragraph of Claim 2 was also changed to read (using said correction factor ... to establish a correction coefficient... " in the amended claims because the factors may also be used directly as the matrix coefficients. See, for example, Paragraph 34, wherein the number of sub-regions used to measure the distortion is the same as the number of pixels in the system, so that the coefficients would simply equal the correction factors (i.e., the first order terms in equations 6 and 7). This change in the limitation language is not believed to affect the patentability of the claims because the distinguishing features over the prior art are not changed.

In her statement of the reasons for the allowability of the various claims, the Examiner mentioned that Claims 10, 11, 20 and 21 were deemed allowable because the prior art fails to disclose a method of correcting intensity distortion introduced by the system in a multi-channel imaging system using a transfer function correction matrix. In that regard, the applicants realized that they neglected to include claims directed simply to that function. New Claims 27 and 28 have been submitted to fill that gap. Consideration of these new claims, which would avoid the necessity for filing a continuation application, would be greatly appreciated.

In view of the foregoing, the remaining pending claims are believed to recite patentable subject matter in allowable form. The applicants and the undersigned again wish to thank the Examiner for the detailed examination and the relevant new art made of record.

A Credit Card Payment Form is enclosed to cover the fee due for the additional total claims and independent claims pending as a result of this response (total pending claims: 28 - 6 cancelled = 22; total pending independent claims: 10 - 3 original = 7 additional independent claims). Please charge any other amount deemed to be due with this response to our Deposit Account No. 04-1935.

Respectfully submitted,



Antonio R. Durando
Reg. No. 28,409
520-243-3383 Direct Phone
520-577-6988 Direct Fax